



Wildland-Urban Interface and Statewide Wildfire Risk Mapping Rulemaking Advisory Committees (RACs) Meeting Notes & Action Items September 30th, 2021

I. Agenda

1. **Welcome, Agenda & Materials**
Welcome to Combined RAC 1 and RAC 2 Meeting, opening and updates.
2. **Review Updated Workplan**
3. **Refine Recommendation from September 16 Meeting:** At what interval should the Oregon Explorer be updated?
 - **Updated Recommendation (based on September 16 meeting):** The Department recommends that OSU updates the Oregon Explorer and other web-based tools for SB762 within 12 months, but no sooner than 9 months, after updates to the most current wildfire risk assessment.
4. **New Question: 2.** How should wildfire risk be calculated?
 - **Recommendation:** The Department recommends that wildfire risk be calculated as a combined value of how often wildfires occur and intensity of such wildfires.
5. **New Question: 3.** How should “vegetative fuels” be defined?
 - **Recommendation:** The Department recommends defining “vegetative fuels” as “any land or clearing that, during any time of the year, contains enough plant growth or slash to constitute a fire hazard, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed.”
6. **New Question: 4.** How should “wildland fuels” be defined?
 - **Recommendation:** The Department recommends defining “wildland fuels” as “grasslands, brushlands, woodlands, timberlands, or wilderness.”
7. **Public Comment**
8. **Process Check-in:**
 - Discussion Protocol
 - Homework
 - Process improvements
9. **Next Steps**
Confirm action items, discuss follow-up, and share topics for next meeting.



II. Attachments

- Attachment 1: Participant List
- Attachment 2: Polling Report

III. Action Items

Action Items	Who?	By When?
9/30 Meeting Follow-up		
1. Post September 30 meeting materials to website.	ODF	10/12
2. Review comments on Questions 3 and 4 and plan/execute next steps.	ODF	10/12
3. Review Issue Sub-questions and Sequencing. Amend Workplan, if needed.	ODF	10/12
4. Prepare for 10/14/21 Meeting	ODF and ICM	10/12

IV. Relevant Links

1. Sept. 30th, 2021 Official Meeting Record: [\[link\]](#)
2. ODF RAC Website: <https://www.oregon.gov/odf/board/Pages/rac.aspx>
3. Oregon Explorer Natural Resources Digital Library: <https://oregonexplorer.info/topics/wildfire-risk?ptopic=62>
4. Oregon Explorer Statewide Map: https://tools.oregonexplorer.info/OE_HtmlViewer/index.html?viewer=wildfireplanning

V. RAC Discussion and Input on ODF Recommendations 1-4

Discussion Protocol:

1. State Question
2. ODF and/or OSU Recommendation(s)
3. Basis for Recommendation (e.g., the reasoning behind it.)
4. What the Recommendation Does NOT Mean
5. RAC Clarifying Questions
6. Member Discussion with Q&A
7. Preliminary and/or Final Polling
8. Document Result:
 - a) Consensus or No Consensus
 - b) Revisit Next Meeting or Later in Process
9. Reminder: Either Way, Opportunity for RAC Member Comments to Accompany ODF Staff Report to Board



Question No. 1

The RAC members continued to discuss Question No. 1, which was previously discussed at the September 16 meeting and received feedback during the in-between meeting input opportunity (Google form).

The table below represents the question and recommendation as stated in the Workplan; comments received from RAC members from the input opportunity and during the September 30 meeting; and polling question and results with edits that were suggested during the September 30 meeting.

Question No. 1 & Recommendation as Stated in the Workplan	Comments Received from the Input Opportunity and Comments During September 30 Meeting	Polling Question & Results with Edits that were Suggested During the September 30 Meeting
<p>Question No. 1: At what interval should the Oregon Explorer be updated?</p> <p>Updated Recommendation (based on September 16 meeting): The Department recommends that OSU updates the Oregon Explorer and other web-based tools for SB762 within 12 months, but no sooner than 9 months, after updates to the most current wildfire risk assessment.</p>	<p>Results from Input Opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 total responses • Reached consensus • 13 people polled a 1 • 5 people polled a 2 • 0 people polled a 3 <p>Comments Received During September 30 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured timeline • Measured in years • Impact on appeals • Regulatory trigger • Does it mean, “Quantitative Wildfire Risk Assessment?” • All tools at same time or sequenced? • other stakeholders such as BCD to have their mapping information available within the same time frame. <p><i>Additional comments can be found in the meeting chat below or via the recording.</i></p>	<p>Revised Recommendation During September 30 Meeting: OSU will update the Oregon Explorer within 12 months after any updates to the Quantitative Wildfire Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Results from Poll During September 30 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consensus • 9 people polled a 1 • 3 people polled a 2 • 1 person polled a 3 • 2 people abstained



Question No. 2

ODF and OSU introduced Question No. 2 and its accompanying recommendation. The input opportunity results (Google form) and discussion during the September 30 meeting are captured in the below table.

Question No. 2 & Recommendation as Stated in the Workplan	Comments Received from the Input Opportunity and Comments During September 30 Meeting	Polling Question & Results with Edits that were Suggested During the September 30 Meeting
<p>Question No. 2: How should wildfire risk be calculated?</p> <p>Recommendation: The Department recommends that wildfire risk be calculated as a combined value of how often wildfires occur and intensity of such wildfires.</p>	<p>Results from Input Opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 total responses received • 12 people supported or agreed with the recommendation • 2 people submitted comments that did not indicate support nor non-support • 0 people did not support • 1 person did not respond <p>Comments Received Through Input Opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define intensity of wildfires. • Certified methodology should be used. • Concerns included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vagueness ○ Use of the word land ○ Inclusion of everything ○ Blending the mapping into the WUI criteria <p><i>Additional comments can be found in the meeting chat below or via the recording.</i></p>	<p>Revised Recommendation During September 30 Meeting (Poll #1, results attached): The Department recommends that wildfire risk* be calculated as a combined value of burn probability and intensity of such wildfires.</p> <p><i>*Insert definition in rule for wildfire risk (or hazard if that is used): Wildfire risk is calculated on wildfire hazard based on how often wildfires occur and intensity.</i></p> <p>Results from Poll During September 30 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus • 19 people polled a 1 • 0 people polled a 2 • 0 people polled a 3 • 5 people abstained



Question No. 3

ODF and OSU introduced Question No. 3 and its accompanying recommendation. The input opportunity results (Google form) and discussion during the September 30 meeting are captured in the below table.

Question No. 3 & Recommendation as Stated in the Workplan	Comments Received from the Input Opportunity (Google Form) and During the September 30 Meeting	Polling Results During the September 30 Meeting
<p>Question No. 3: How should “vegetative fuels” be defined?</p> <p>Recommendation: The Department recommends defining “vegetative fuels” as “any land or clearing that, during any time of the year, contains enough plant growth or slash to constitute a fire hazard, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed.”</p>	<p>Results from Input Opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 total responses received • 3 people supported the recommendation • 6 people made suggestions and/or comments • 3 people disagreed with the recommendation or thought it was too broad • 3 people did not respond <p>Comments Received Through Input Opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overly broad • Concerned 'land' is the basis of this definition rather than the fuels. • Pulls in anything that could burn, which dilutes the purpose of identifying wildfire risk and is why it needs to have a reference point to both WUI and wildfire risk mapping instead of a stand-a-lone definition. • A well-manicured lawn, managed tree farm, or active farm operation would constitute "vegetative fuels" under this section - the WUI 	<p>Recommendation Polled on During September 30 Meeting: The Department recommends defining “vegetative fuels” as “any land or clearing that, during any time of the year, contains enough plant growth or slash to constitute a fire hazard, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed.”</p> <p>Results from Poll During September 30 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consensus • 10 people polled a 1 • 5 people polled a 2 • 4 people polled a 3 • 4 people abstained



	<p>should not be so broad. Is there any property in Oregon that would not contain "vegetative fuels" under this definition? If so, please describe.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Should a threshold be established to distinguish between vegetative fuels that may be less susceptible to wildfire and those that are more susceptible?• Should there be a distinction between vegetative fuels which are actively managed as part of a forest operation, farm operation, or as residential or commercial landscaping and maintained v. those that are not?• How to address lands that may have annual variability in their fire hazard. <p>Comments Received During September 30 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does not include "wildland fuels"• Further definition in criteria• Manicured lawns not included• Add language to remove those types not intended for regulation by better defining the steps; perhaps via fire risk• Managing goes into the ultimate classification• Relationship to defensible space	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take out lands and focus on fuels • Can we separate cultivated crops and consider fir <p><i>Additional comments can be found in the meeting chat below or via the recording.</i></p>	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Question No. 4

ODF and OSU introduced Question No. 4 and its accompanying recommendation. The input opportunity results (Google form) and discussion during the September 30 meeting are captured in the below table.

Question No. 4 & Recommendation as Stated in the Workplan	Comments Received from the Input Opportunity (Google Form)	Comments Received During the September 30 Meeting
<p>Question No. 4: How should “wildland fuels” be defined?”</p> <p>Recommendation: The Department recommends defining “wildland fuels” as “grasslands, brushlands, woodlands, timberlands, or wilderness.”</p>	<p>Results from Input Opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 total responses received • 4 people supported the recommendation • 7 people made suggestions and/or comments • 2 people disagreed with the recommendation or thought it was too broad • 2 people did not respond <p>Comments Received Through Input Opportunity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need a landscape reference to WUI or wildland fire risk. Without it you will be mapping, parks, neighborhoods, green space, etc.. within the urban setting and dilute the focus of where treatments are needed based on WUI and wildland fire risk. • The NWCG defines wildland as - An area in which 	<p>Comments Received During September 30 Meeting to Consider for Revised Recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazard mapping will follow • Designated wilderness area • Minimum Area? • Wild and scenic area? Where do they fall • These terms need definition • Other public lands • Define specific fuel load vs geographic space <p><i>Additional comments can be found in the meeting chat below or via the recording.</i></p>



	<p>development is essentially non-existent, except for roads, railroads, powerlines, and similar transportation facilities. Structures, if any, are widely scattered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no limiting factor to this language. For example, if a 10-acre parcel contains a small patch of blackberries, does the parcel contain "wildland fuels"? • How are pasture and rangeland treated and whether managed land will be treated the same as unmanaged land. • Should a threshold be established to distinguish between vegetative fuels that may be less susceptible to wildfire and those that are more susceptible? • Fuels definitions are available in the International Wildland Urban Interface Code (IWUIC) to the existing ODF terms defined in statutes and rules. • Fuel definitions in the IWUI refer to diameter or material more so than vegetative type. • Address SE corner of state. 	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

VI. Meeting Chat

- 09:02:56 From Annie Kilburg Smith, Triangle (she/her): If you are a member, please start your video and update your name to "RAC Member: Name, Organization"



- 09:03:19 From Annie Kilburg Smith, Triangle (she/her): If you are a member of the public, please take yourself off video and update your name to "Name, Affiliation. This will help the facilitation team distinguish between RAC members and members of the public. Thank you!
- 09:03:34 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: I will turn on my camera in about 10 minutes - getting into my office still.
- 09:04:53 From RAC - Michele Bradley, Special Districts: I will have to hop off from 10-12 for a meeting that I can't miss. I'll rejoin as soon as I am able.

Question No. 1: At what interval should the Oregon Explorer be updated?

- **Updated Recommendation (based on September 16 meeting):** The Department recommends that OSU updates the Oregon Explorer and other web-based tools for SB762 within 12 months, but no sooner than 9 months, after updates to the most current wildfire risk assessment.

Meeting Chat:

- 09:23:20 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: What is the value of saying that OE will be updated *no sooner than* 9 months? Why not as soon as possible?
- 09:27:03 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Tim I heard your answer, but I still have the same question as Pam - 9 to 12 months seems like a narrow window.
- 09:29:00 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: I wonder if a better way of getting at the intent behind the "no sooner than 9 months" is to add some language around interagency coordination being required in this update?
- 09:30:59 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: I agree with Jim. It's important not to change the game on people mid-stream.
- 09:32:10 From RAC - Jon Jinings, DLCD: Wouldn't that be covered by the "Goal Post" rule, which is actually statute?
- 09:32:55 From RAC - Kyle Williams (OFIC): unfamiliar with the Goal post rule? I assume there is a regular interval to updating the QWRA? what is that interval and how firm is the language and process around that? could we adapt that language/interval language into this so we can achieve what Jim is talking about?
- 09:38:41 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: As stated, I would prefer, "... and other web-based tools for SB 762 within 12 months after updates to the most current wildfire risk assessment as completed by OSU such that any regulation change is officially put into place at 12 months after the risk assessment it updated."
- 09:41:05 From RAC Dave Hunnicutt - OPOA: I don't know if the goalpost rule applies here - it would apply to any DLCD rule provisions, but I'm not sure it would apply to DCBS or OSFM requirements. The statute (for counties) is ORS 215.427(3). There's also a corresponding city provision in Chapter 227.
- 09:41:55 From RAC Member: Erica Fischer : I can support Chris' comment on the building code cycle. The International Building Code cycles every three years and then states and counties



determine whether they are going to adopt them. Oregon does not automatically update their codes with newly published building codes each time a new code comes out.

- 09:42:26 From RAC - Jon Jinings, DLCD: Thanks, Dave. I don't know about other programs either.
- 09:43:07 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: It will be important to clarify what functionality will be provided within the Oregon Wildfire Risk Explorer tool vs the Building Codes Division tool, which sound like they will be separate things for separate purposes
- 09:44:44 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: Based on Chris' comment about Building Codes Division 3-year time window, the "other web-based tools" language may need to be removed or modified?
- 09:45:55 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: I am comfortable with changing my vote to a 2 consistent with Tim's comments.

Question No. 2: How should wildfire risk be calculated?

- **Recommendation:** The Department recommends that wildfire risk be calculated as a combined value of how often wildfires occur and intensity of such wildfires.

Meeting Chat:

- 09:47:17 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Tim if you get back early and have a chance for a question that I think others probably know, let me know.
- 09:52:42 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Tim never mind I *think* I figured it out.
- 09:59:38 From RAC Holly Kerns AOC PD: I'm not sure whose comment it was, but if you are willing, could you clarify what you were meaning by "certified methodology"?
- 10:02:08 From RAC 2 | Kerry Metlen, The Nature Conservancy: That was TNC's comment, really just emphasizing the need to stick with a standardized methodology, specifically Scott et al 2013 (RMRS GTR 315). Note that Dr. Dunn was just referencing that publication.
- 10:04:03 From RAC Holly Kerns AOC PD: Thank you Kerry, I understand now.
- 10:05:40 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: Chris, what I think I heard you say was that burn probability is a function of HVRA's. Can you help me understand how the location of wildlife habitat (one of the layers on the image) will increase or decrease burn probability? It seems to me like burn probability would be based more on fuel type, topography, public access, etc.
- 10:06:1 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: We should be careful about using the right terminology about risk vs exposure as Chris just presented. It sounds like 'risk' will not enter into the rule, just 'exposure'. Can we clarify that we are using fire exposure to define property-level risk within the WUI, to differentiate this from the overall wildfire risk map (that will be released later)?
- 10:07:02 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Can we get answers to the two questions above from Chris before we move on?
- 10:07:28 From Annie Kilburg Smith, Triangle (she/her): Hi Mary Anne, we will pause for clarifying questions in a moment once Tim wraps up his piece.
- 10:08:13 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: HVRA's are not part of burn probability



- 10:19:19 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: It would be helpful to have a glossary of terminology for RAC members to refer back to
- 10:19:41 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: Jon I think you got it right but backwards in the terms :)
- 10:23:50 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: Change risk to hazard
- 10:24:11 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: Or say something about how risk in this context is measured as hazard?
- 10:24:15 From RAC 1&2 Jim McCauley, LOC: support, keep language the same!
- 10:24:29 From RAC- Lauren Smith, AOC: Support, keeping language the same
- 10:24:37 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: My understanding is that the only place where eNVC and the QWRA are actually discussed is in Sec. 18 (landscape resiliency) which has nothing to do with this mapping other than the section is named "Reduction of Wildfire Risk".
- 10:24:42 From RAC - Amelia Porterfield, TNC: I think SB 762 says "risk" so that's probably relevant to the rule
- 10:25:02 From RAC - Kyle Williams (OFIC): Support for me as well. Fine with the hazard clarification but I think the bill language is driving the bus on the nomenclature if that's helpful for folks.
- 10:27:52 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: It seems that what is really meant by "how often wildfires occur" is really "the likelihood that wildfires will occur" This might be a distinction without much meaning, but I'd love to hear from the experts whether that's true.
- 10:28:57 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: Thank you Tim, that is exactly what I think would be helpful within a broader context
- 10:29:07 From RAC -Mary Kyle McCurdy 1KF (she/her): I agree with what Tim just said
- 10:29:14 From RAC 1&2 Jim McCauley, LOC: just don't see how this language adjustment improves anything..
- 10:29:31 From RAC Member: Erica Fischer: This might be helpful for everyone: A hazard is something that has the potential to cause harm while risk is the likelihood of harm taking place, based on exposure to that hazard.
- 10:30:29 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: Thank you Erica! Very helpful!
- 10:35:36 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Annie, I am not voting a three but have a process concern that can wait until after this one because I don't think this will be a close vote.
- 10:38:00 From Sam Imperati: At end of the day, each item will be reviewed as a package. We're just teeing up the issues one at a time.
- 10:38:15 From Annie Kilburg Smith, Triangle (she/her): Recommendation we are polling on: The Department recommends that wildfire risk* be calculated as a combined value of burn probability and intensity of such wildfires.
- 10:42:43 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: When are we starting again?
- 10:42:51 From Annie Kilburg Smith, Triangle (she/her): Please return at 10:50!
- 10:42:58 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: Thank you!



- 10:42:5 From Derek Gasperini—ODF: 10:50 a.m. Thanks,
- 11:03:31 From RAC Holly Kerns AOC PD: Regarding the voting process- It would be helpful to me to discuss the context of each decision we're asked to poll on. I often think I understand, but it would be helpful if staff would explain exactly how they see the decision we're making impacting the broader whole in the regulatory sense. The polling setup makes that less clear for me than a discussion-based approach, although I'm not opposed to it- especially with this many people
- 11:04:18 From Jim Kelly, Chair, Board of Forestry: Relative to what Sam is saying about his voting process, you have had some Board of Forestry members attending these meetings most of the time, and noting many of these suggestions/modifications. Today you have had three Board members listening in.

Question No. 3: How should “vegetative fuels” be defined?

- **Recommendation:** The Department recommends defining “vegetative fuels” as “any land or clearing that, during any time of the year, contains enough plant growth or slash to constitute a fire hazard, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed.”

Meeting Chat:

- 11:10:09 From RAC 2 | Kerry Metlen | The Nature Conservancy: As a reminder, here is the WUI definition, for context around the term: WUI: That geographical area where structures and other human development meets or intermingles with wildland or vegetative fuels
- 11:12:23 From RAC Member: Erica Fischer: The Federal Registrar quantification of WUI property is the following. This is coming up later in the agenda.
- Areas mapped nationally as WUI are census blocks with the following requirements: At least 6.17 housing units per km² (1 housing unit per 40 acres) > 50% wildland vegetation within the terrestrial area of the census block or within 2.4 km of a large area (> 5 km²) with at least 75% wildland vegetation
- 11:15:48 From RAC Dave Hunnicutt - OPOA: If we're going to rely upon the federal agency definitions, then we need to identify the purpose for the federal definition, as the breadth/narrowness of the definition may depend upon the reason it was enacted. Our definition of WUI will have significant regulatory impacts upon property owners. We need to take that into account in making our choices.
- 11:27:14 From RAC Member: Erica Fischer: I hope that this definition helps. Here is the definition of defensible space per the International WUI code. The purpose is the slow the rate and intensity of wildfire. A lawn would already do this even though it is categorized as vegetative fuel.
- Defensible space (IWUI): An area either natural or man-made, where material capable of allowing a fire to spread unchecked has been treated, cleared or modified to slow the rate and intensity of an advancing wildfire and to create an area of fire suppression operations to occur.



- 11:27:59 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB : Thanks, Erica. My concern with defensible space is much more around managed crop lands and making sure people don't have to pull out cash crops.
- 11:28:16 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Or otherwise clear in a manner that is going to create other environmental risks.
- 11:28:36 From RAC Holly Kerns AOC PD: Is a lawn included? I don't see how that constitutes a fire hazard, which is the qualifying term in the proposed definition. It seems like a methodology question on how that will be dropped out during a mapping process. Am I reading this wrong?
- 11:30:36 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: Wouldn't croplands only be in the WUI if there was a structure there?
- 11:31:26 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: This is the best I could come up with... "any land or clearing outside of wildland that pose a fire hazard and contain enough plant growth or slash to carry a flame, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed." In this case, lawns and some cultivated lands would fall out because they would not "pose a fire hazard" depending on what criteria we place on fire hazard.
- 11:31:3 From RAC Dave Hunnicutt - OPOA: If we're acknowledging that manicured lawns aren't really "vegetative fuels", then why are we placing the burden on the property owner to fix a mapping mistake? There's a significant cost to appeal that many rural property owners won't be able to afford.
- 11:34:08 From RAC Member: Erica Fischer: The presence of vegetative fuels does not automatically mean high or extreme hazard. The definition of vegetative fuels is used for the WUI mapping. The hazard assessment that Chris will be doing will then include whether the identified vegetative fuels have a high burn probability and intensity.
- 11:35:01 From RAC Dave Hunnicutt - OPOA: Agreed Erica, but the bill allows local governments to regulate in the WUI below high and extreme risk areas.
- 11:35:30 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: The Forest Service hosts a "Fire Effects Information System Glossary" (<https://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/glossary2.html>). That glossary has a definition of fuels: "Fuel is comprised of living and dead vegetation that can be ignited. It is often classified as dead or alive and as natural fuels or those from logging operations. Fuel components refer to such items as downed dead woody material in various size classes, litter, duff, herbaceous vegetation, live foliage, etc."
- 11:35:59 From BOF - Karla Chambers: Chris this is a very important discussion as it was at the heart of the legislation conflict that put this into the Board of Forestry. Yes, there have been tremendous fires in the wheat country, but the source of the fuel and fire so often starts on BLM (where the burnable fuels load continues to grow and not be managed). What burns, and what was the source of the fire needs further discussion. Thank you.
- 11:36:12 From RAC-OFMA-Shawn.Olson : I agree with Erica. The impacts to most of the concerns is going to be based on what is defined based on level of risk. High or extreme
- 11:36:52 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Please everyone remember what Dave said - communities can go further, and certainly will in many instances.



- 11:37:26 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: It is important to keep in mind that the satellite imagery that is informing the fuel mapping would not be expected to be able to differentiate between a manicured lawn and a grass field that is not maintained, for example. This is not an error but is just a known limitation and different purpose of that imagery.
- 11:37:26 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: And thank you Karla - this was the heart of the legislative conflicts and I feel like we were dismissed that ag wouldn't really be impacted, but I'm not seeing where that's true yet.
- 11:37:44 From RAC - Jon Jinings, DLCD: Wouldn't defensible space and other measures only apply to a subject property. In other words, protecting my structures on my property wouldn't result in an imposition on my neighbor, would it
- 11:37:50 From RAC - Jon Jinings, DLCD: ?
- 11:43:23 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: To bring in what Pam posted... "living or dead vegetation on lands outside of wildland that pose a fire hazard, can be ignited and contain enough plant growth or vegetative material to carry a flame, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed."
- 11:56:18 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: It seems to me that some crops *are* more flammable, and thus more dangerous than others. When those crops are far from homes – even outside the defensible space - that's not a problem. In close proximity to homes, it's a risk that should be honestly accounted for.
- 11:56:26 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: To be clear, I am not asking for exclude all ag lands. I am asking to understand if managed crop and rangeland fit the definition of vegetative fuels, and it sounds like the intent is that they will.
- 11:57:23 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: in which case, we may have landowners that have to pull croplands if the state or local government requires through the defensible space requirements. Which we knew would happen if the broad definition of WUI was adopted, so I am not surprised.
- 12:04:12 From RAC 2 - Chris Dunn, Oregon State University: Karla, that may very well be the case. I have not seen an analysis showing where the source of fire derives from within these lands. Regardless, the source of fire is really important in the broader discussion of mitigation actions. I typically see the issues you are bringing up as being about mitigation actions within the broader landscape rather than around the structures within the WUI. Undoubtedly an important discussion and component of tackling reductions in fire risk, but a conversation for the FRRIP group? Other collaborative efforts? Hopefully I'm responding to your thoughts, but please let me know if I am not.
- 12:06:32 From Tim Holschbach - ODF: • Vegetative fuels are those plants that during any time of year contain enough plant growth, slash or debris to constitute a fire hazard.
- 12:06:34 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: Tim - could you put that language in the chat?
- 12:07:58 From RAC - Dylan Kruse, SNW: Tim, where does that definition come from?
- 12:08:05 From RAC - Dylan Kruse, SNW: Can you clarify?



- 12:10:24 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: 3 = I think this misses a critical distinction that should be made between managed lands and unmanaged lands.
- 12:10:59 From RAC - Dylan Kruse, SNW: Does this capture dead material?
- 12:11:19 From RAC - Dylan Kruse, SNW: FEIS definition is: Fuel is comprised of living and dead vegetation that can be ignited. It is often classified as dead or alive and as natural fuels or those from logging operations. Fuel components refer to such items as downed dead woody material in various size classes, litter, duff, herbaceous vegetation, live foliage, etc.
- 12:11:25 From Tim Holschbach - ODF: Yes, part of slash and debris
- 12:12:12 From RAC Dave Hunnicutt - OPOA: You are misreading the intent of the "categories of land" language in SB 762. That language applies to zoning;
- 12:12:33 From RAC 1&2 Jim McCauley, LOC: remain concerned about diluting the focus with a more expansive definition. managed/cultivated etc... should be separated from unmanaged...
- 12:12:39 From RAC- Lauren Smith, AOC: A agree with Dave and Mary Anne. The exclusion language was related to land use designations
- 12:12:41 From RAC, Amanda Astor - AOL: Would fire hazard in this definition be tied to high and extreme fire hazard criteria defined in RAC 2?
- 12:13:32 From RAC - Amelia Porterfield, TNC: I disagree with Dave's read of the legislation - category of land wasn't discussed as restricted to zoning.
- 12:13:53 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: It was Amelia - it definitely was in committee and on the floor.
- 12:15:10 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Otherwise all these definitions would have to pull in all land and what's the point? Managed and unmanaged land is similar to land with homes and land without homes. The logical extension of the reasoning would be that nothing could be excluded from the WUI, and it would be all lands. That's illogical.
- 12:15:14 From RAC Dave Hunnicutt - OPOA: If any distinction is considered a "category" than everything must be included in the WUI. I doubt that is consistent with any national standard, no matter what the purpose for the standard is.
- 12:19:11 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: So I don't leave my hand up for hours, Tim is there an easy place you can refer us for the definitions of each of those terms or drop them in the chat?
- 12:19:22 From RAC - Jon Jinings, DLCD: Vegetative fuels are plant growth, slash or debris, naturally occurring or otherwise, that during any time of the year are sufficient to constitute a fire hazard. Vegetative fuels do not include wildland fuels or irrigated crops.

Question No. 4: How should "wildland fuels" be defined?"

- **Recommendation:** The Department recommends defining "wildland fuels" as "grasslands, brushlands, woodlands, timberlands, or wilderness."

Meeting Chat:

- 12:21:05 From Tim Holschbach - ODF: (9)



- “Forestland” means any woodland, brushland, timberland, grazing land or clearing that, during any time of the year, contains enough forest growth, slashing or vegetation to constitute, in the judgment of the forester, a fire hazard, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed. As used in this subsection, “clearing” means any grassland, improved area, lake, meadow, mechanically or manually cleared area, road, rocky area, stream or other similar forestland opening that is surrounded by or contiguous to forestland and that has been included in areas classified as forestland under ORS 526.305 (Definitions for ORS 526.305 to 526.370) to 526.370 (Seeding agreements as condition of supervision of burning on forestlands).
- 12:23:18 From RAC 2 | Kerry Metlen | The Nature Conservancy: Just help the conversation along, a definition for "wildland" is "an area in which development is essentially nonexistent, except for roads, railroads, power lines and similar facilities" which to me seems more direct than a listing of vegetation types
- 12:23:30 From RAC 1/2 Jason Robison CCBUTI: How about wild and scenic areas? Where would these fall?
- 12:24:05 From RAC - Amelia Porterfield, TNC: I'm curious whether staff considered using the International WUI Code definition of "Wildland" for this conversation? It reads “An area in which development is essentially nonexistent, except for roads, railroads, power lines and similar facilities”
- 12:24:19 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: There are wild and scenic rivers - are there also wild and scenic areas? Who designates them?
- 12:25:40 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: There are many public lands, besides Wilderness, that are not primarily used for timber harvest. Certain Wild & Scenic designations are some.
- 12:25:52 From RAC Roger Johnson: Can you confirm that timberlands includes national forest lands and O&C lands in addition to wilderness?
- 12:26:18 From Jim Kelly, Chair, Board of Forestry: It has been good to witness a more cooperative process so far today, despite the tough issues faced. As the Board ultimately will have to answer to the legislature’s timeline, this progress is essential. So thanks. I will need to drop off now. You still have two BoF members listening in though.
- 12:26:31 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: On Federal public lands, Congress or the Executive branch designates them.
- 12:26:54 From RAC 1/2 Jason Robison CCBUTI: Thanks for that clarification Tim.
- 12:27:08 From RAC Holly Kerns AOC PD: I agree with Amanda, I think scale of the vegetation matters a lot. Since we're using this term and vegetative fuels to define a WUI, the context of the terms is really key. The definitions need to begin making distinctions about what is included AND excluded. I think both definitions need to be more refined for this use.
- 12:27:48 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Agree with Holly.
- 12:27:59 From RAC - Megan Creutzburg, INR: I need to leave for another meeting, thank you all
- 12:28:30 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Can someone answer the question for me whether lands are designated wild and scenic?



- 12:28:30 From RAC- Lauren Smith, AOC: I also agree with Holly
- 12:28:36 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: I really thought only waters were
- 12:28:54 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: and don't want to protect land classes I don't understand what they are, who designates them, and that I haven't heard of before.
- 12:29:13 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: There are scenic areas but those are often like viewpoints or regions - which are way too broad for this classification
- 12:29:28 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: Re: Federal Wild & Scenic: it includes both the water & the adjacent land. Each designation is unique.
- 12:30:01 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: The waters are designated wild and scenic.. The lands are protected through a management plan - I do not believe the lands are officially designated.
- 12:30:2 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: But I see the point that those may not qualify as wilderness or timberlands strictly
- 12:30:35 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: @ Mary Anne - if need be, we can work this out offline.
- 12:30:55 From RAC Member: Erica Fischer: The fuels are being defined now: vegetation and wildland. The density of the fuel is considered in the analysis of the land for burn probability and wildfire intensity. Fuel loading (density of vegetation/fuel on land) is where the quantity of fuel comes into play (re: Holly and Amanda).
- 12:30:5 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: I think it's just a wording issue if we go down that path to make clear what we are talking about.
- 12:31:33 From RAC 1&2 Jim McCauley, LOC: on federal lands there is a land designation connected to a Wild and Scenic river. the overlay with out a doubt changes the management options. for private lands with a wild and scenic designation its more complicated on whether the private landowner has any ability to manage their lands.
- 12:36:00 From RAC Holly Kerns AOC PD: Hi Erica, thanks. Quantity matters, but what I was meaning was scale of the distribution of fuels. I think we're meaning to be more broad than a corner of someone's yard, or a yard, or a couple of juniper trees, but the definition doesn't help me make that distinction between what is and isn't going to be in the WUI- as written, it's really broad and scale may help start refining the concepts down.
- 12:38:05 From RAC Member: Erica Fischer: Thank you for the clarification Holly! This will be utilized in the federal registrar's definition:
- Areas mapped nationally as WUI are census blocks with the following requirements: At least 6.17 housing units per km² (1 housing unit per 40 acres) > 50% wildland vegetation within the terrestrial area of the census block or within 2.4 km of a large area (> 5 km²) with at least 75% wildland vegetation
- There is scale within this definition.
- 12:40:16 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: There are communities adjacent to Wilderness.



- 12:41:10 From RAC Holly Kerns AOC PD: Will that be adopted into the rules? Are we intending to define WUIs at the census block scale? Sorry if I missed that earlier, but I'm not clear how that ties to our work specifically. Forgive me for being dense.
- 12:42:33 From RAC - Mary Anne Cooper, OFB: Holly I have the same question. I am confused!
- 12:44:35 From Tim Holschbach - ODF: Wildland fuels are defined as an area where natural or native vegetation occur in an area in which development is essentially non-existent, and may include grasslands, brushlands, rangelands, woodlands, timberlands, or wilderness.
- 12:48:53 From RAC - Jon Jinings, DLCD: So, if I'm understanding this proposed definition correctly, the westside of Bend, Oregon would not have "wildland fuels" because of the existence of homes and structures in the forest environment. Is that correct?
- 12:49:51 From RAC - Pam Hardy, Western Environmental Law Center: I think that's right - it would just have vegetative fuels. But it would be adjacent to Wildlands fuels.
- 12:49:53 From RAC 2 - Chris Dunn, Oregon State University: I believe you are correct Jon, but there is plenty of vegetative fuels.
- 12:54:07 From RAC - Jon Jinings, DLCD: Thanks, Guys!

DRAFT



Attachment 1: Participant List

Organization	Primary Contact Person	September 30 Attendance	Name	September 30 Attendance
Members (alphabetical by first name)			Alternates	
Associated Oregon Loggers	Amanda Astor/Rex Storm	x	Rex Storm	
Jackson County Fire	Bob Horton	x		
Oregon State University - Extension	Chris Dunn	x	Erica Fischer	x
Oregon Property Owner's Association	Dave Hunnicut	x	Samantha Bayer	
Sustainable Northwest	Dylan Kruse	x		
Association of Oregon County Planning Directors	Holly Kerns	x	Lindsey Eichner	
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	Jason Robison	x	Tim Vrendenburg	
League of Oregon Cities	Jim McCauley	x		
Department of Land Use & Conservation	Jon Jinings	x	Sadie Carney	x
The Nature Conservancy	Kerry Metlen	x		
The Nature Conservancy	Amelia Porterfield	x		
Oregon Forest Industries Council	Kyle Williams	x	Mike Eliason	x
Association of Oregon Counties	Lauren Smith	x		
Tualatin Valley Fire	Les Hallman	x		
Hood River County Planning Commission	Leti Moretti			
Oregon Home Builders	Mark Long			
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper	x		



1000 Friends	Mary Kyle McCurdy	x		
Oregon State University - Institute Natural Resources	Megan Creutzburg	x		
Special Districts Association	Michele Bradley, President	x	Jason Jantzi	
Oregon Fire Chiefs Association	Nicole PalmHazelbaker	x		
Western Enviromental Law Center	Pam Hardy	x	Marlee Goska	x
Oregon Small Woodlands Association	Roger Beyer	x		
Sisters Fire	Roger Johnson	x		
Oregon Fire Marshall's Association	Shawn Olson	x	Tanner Fairrington	
Office of the State Fire Marshal	Travis Medema	x	Chad Hawkins	x
Advisory (alphabetical by first name)				
United States Forest Service	Ian Rickert			
Bureau of Land Management	Richard Parrish			
ODF & Facilitation Project Team				
Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF)	Tim Holschbach	x		
ODF	Jenna Trentadue	x		
ODF	Derek Gasperini	x		
ODF	Adam Meyer	x		
Triangle, RAC No. 2 Facilitation Team	Annie Kilburg Smith	x		
Triangle, RAC No. 2 Facilitation Team	Anna Shepherd	x		
ICM Resolutions, RAC No. 1 Facilitation Team	Sam Imperati	x		
ICM Resolutions, RAC No. 1 Facilitation Team	Millie Webb			
Oregon Consensus	Robin Harkless	x		



Attachment 2: Polling Results

Poll #: 1 (Question No. 2)

Revised Recommendation for Question No. 2: The Department recommends that wildfire risk be calculated as a combined value of how often wildfires occur and intensity of such wildfires. Do you support this recommendation?

Organization	Contact Person	Not Here	Abstain = 0	1	2	3
1000 Friends	Mary Kyle McCurdy			x		
Associated Oregon Loggers	Amanda Astor / (Rex Storm)			x		
Association of Oregon Counties	Lauren Smith			x		
Association of Oregon County Planning Directors	Holly Kerns / Lindsey Eicher		x			
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	Jason Robison			x		
Department of Land Use & Conservation	Jon Jinings/Sadie Carney			x		
Hood River County Planning Commission	Leti Moretti	x				
Jackson County Fire	Robert (Bob) Horton			x		
League of Oregon Cities	Jim McCauley			x		
Office of the State Fire Marshal	Travis Medema / (Chad Hawkins)			x		
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper			x		
Oregon Fire Chiefs Association	Nicole Hazelbaker		x			
Oregon Fire Marshall's Association	Shawn Olson /Tanner Fairrington			x		
Oregon Forest Industries Council	Kyle Williams			x		
Oregon Home Builders	Mark Long	x				
Oregon Property Owner's Association	Dave Hunnicut / (Samantha Bayer)			x		
Oregon Small Woodlands Association	Roger Beyer		x			
Oregon State University - Extension	Chris Dunn			x		
Oregon State University - Extension	Erica Fischer			x		
Sisters Fire	Roger Johnson			x		



Special Districts Association	Michele Bradley / (Jason Jantzi)		x			
Sustainable Northwest	Dylan Kruse			x		
The Nature Conservancy	Amelia Porterfield/Kerry Metlen			x		
Tualatin Valley Fire	Les Hallman		x			
Western Environmental Law Center	Pam Hardy			x		
Oregon State University	Megan Creutzburg			x		
Totals:		2	5	19	0	0
Code:		Not Here	Ab-stain	1	2	3

RESULT: Consensus

Summary of Major Reasons in Support: See meeting notes and chat above and recording.

Minority Proposal: None

Summary of Major in Reasons in Opposition: None

DRAFT



Poll #: 2 (Question No. 3)

Recommendation for Question No. 3: The Department recommends defining “vegetative fuels” as “any land or clearing that, during any time of the year, contains enough plant growth or slash to constitute a fire hazard, regardless of how the land is zoned or taxed.” Do you support this recommendation?

Organization	Contact Person	Not Here	Abstain = 0	1	2	3
1000 Friends	Mary Kyle McCurdy			x		
Associated Oregon Loggers	Amanda Astor / (Rex Storm)				x	
Association of Oregon Counties	Lauren Smith					x
Association of Oregon County Planning Directors	Holly Kerns / Lindsey Eicher		x			
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	Jason Robison			x		
Department of Land Use & Conservation	Jon Jinings/Sadie Carney				x	
Hood River County Planning Commission	Leti Moretti	x				
Jackson County Fire	Robert (Bob) Horton			x		
League of Oregon Cities	Jim McCauley				x	
Office of the State Fire Marshal	Travis Medema / (Chad Hawkins)				x	
Oregon Farm Bureau	Mary Anne Cooper					x
Oregon Fire Chiefs Association	Nicole Hazelbaker		x			
Oregon Fire Marshall's Association	Shawn Olson /Tanner Fairrington			x		
Oregon Forest Industries Council	Kyle Williams					x
Oregon Home Builders	Mark Long	x				
Oregon Property Owner's Association	Dave Hunnicut / (Samantha Bayer)					x
Oregon Small Woodlands Association	Roger Beyer		x			
Oregon State University - Extension	Chris Dunn			x		
Oregon State University - Extension	Erica Fischer				x	
Sisters Fire	Roger Johnson			x		
Special Districts Association	Michele Bradley / (Jason Jantzi)		x			



Sustainable Northwest	Dylan Kruse			x		
The Nature Conservancy	Amelia Porterfield/Kerry Metlen			x		
Tualatin Valley Fire	Les Hallman			x		
Western Environmental Law Center	Pam Hardy			x		
Oregon State University	Megan Creutzburg					
Totals:		2	4	10	5	4
Code:		Not Here	Ab-stain	1	2	3

RESULT: No Consensus

Summary of Major Reasons in Support: See Meeting Recording and Member Submissions, which are in the Meeting Chat, below.

Minority Proposal: See meeting notes and chat above and recording.

Summary of Major in Reasons in Opposition: See meeting notes and chat above and recording.

DRAFT